UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,915	12/07/2005	Jacobus Josephus Maria Ruigrok	NL030681US1	9555
	7590 11/01/201 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 3001			LOUIE, MANDY C	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001		001	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1715	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/559,915	RUIGROK ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	WANDI C. LOUIE	1713	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor		TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reju	scied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non Co	mpliant Amondment (	DTOL 324)
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		Inpliant Amendment (	1 1 OL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled</li> </ol>		timely filed amendmer	at canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subiliilled iii a separate,	uniely filed afficilatile	it cancelling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 3-8, 10-12, 16-19</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	L NOT ! " " "	110	
<ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the extraphed Information Displaceure Statement(s).</li> </ul>		n condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	F 10/30/00/ Paper NO(8)		
/Timothy H Meeks/	/M. C. L./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1715	Examiner, Art Unit 1715		

Regarding arguments on pg 8 of remarks (filed on 10/13/10) drawn to overly broad interpretation of "different," it is refuted that since the specification does not define different physical processes, it will be given its broadest reasonable interpretation. Although the applicants points to the specification for examples of different physical processes, the claims are not limited to examples in the specification. Though, it is suggested by the examiner that the claims perhaps be amended to recite such limitations.

Regarding arguments on page 10 of remarks drawn to Shappir teaching voltage pulses and not current pulses and references to para 0029-0030, it is pointed out that Shappir teaches the pulses affects the electrical, physical or mechanical properties, wherein thereshold voltage is an example of these properties being affect by the pulses [0029-0030]. It does not appear that Shappir teaches using voltage pulses. In addition, applicant's arguments of Shappir teaching only one physical process, it is noted that Shappir examplifies magnetization vectors, but it is not limited to only magnetization, so one of ordinary skill in the art would glean that Shappir is capable of modifying a plurality of physical processes.

Regarding arguments on page 12 of remarks drawn to Gill failing to teach an current is applied to heat the magnetic layer structure while the magnetic field is applied to the at least one bias layer and is referenced to col 4, I n22-29, col 9 In 45-56; it is refuted that Gill does in fact teach applying a current to a magnetic layer while appling a magnetic field as indicated in col 4, In 4-10. Hence, argument is moot.

As as addressed above, the submitted arguments were deemed unpersuasive, and hence, the same rejections have been maintained.

Applicant's amendment to cancel claim 13 will be entered since such amendment does not change the scope of the pending claims.